

A sharp uniform bound for the distribution of a sum of Bernoulli random variables

R. Cominetti* J. Vaisman†

Abstract

In this paper we establish a uniform bound for the distribution of a sum $S^n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$ of independent non-homogeneous Bernoulli random variables with $\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) = p_i$. Specifically, we prove that $\sigma^n \mathbb{P}(S^n = i) \leq M$ where σ^n denotes the standard deviation of S^n and the constant $M \sim 0.4688$ is the maximum of $u \mapsto \sqrt{2u} e^{-2u} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\frac{u^k}{k!})^2$.

1 Introduction

The main goal of this paper is to establish the following:

Theorem 1 *Let $S^n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$ be a sum of independent non-homogeneous Bernoulli random variables with $\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) = p_i$, and let $\sigma^n = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i(1-p_i)}$ denote its standard deviation. Then, for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have*

$$\sigma^n \mathbb{P}(S^n = i) \leq M \tag{1}$$

with $M = \max_{u \geq 0} \sqrt{2u} e^{-2u} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\frac{u^k}{k!})^2$. This bound is sharp and the constant is approximately $M \sim 0.46882235549939533$.

The novelty lies in the uniform character of the bound (1) and the fact that the constant M is the best possible. This result complements the vast literature on bounds for large deviations probabilities —such as Markov,

*Center for Mathematical Modeling and Departamento de Ingeniería Matemática, Universidad de Chile. Supported by FONDAP Matemáticas Aplicadas, CONICYT-Chile.

†Departamento de Ingeniería Matemática, Universidad de Chile.

Chebyshev, Hoeffding, and Chernoff bounds— which focus on finding sharp estimates for $\mathbb{P}(|S - \mathbb{E}(S)| \geq t)$ when S is a sum of n i.i.d. random variables and $t > 0$. Such large deviations bounds [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13] are very useful in probability and statistics, providing formulas of the type

$$\mathbb{P}(|S - \mathbb{E}(S)| \geq t) \leq f(nt^2)$$

with $f(0) \geq 1$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = 0$ usually with an exponential decay. In our particular context, this implies that $\mathbb{P}(S^n = i)$ tends to 0 whenever i stays away from the mean $\mathbb{E}(S^n)$, a stronger conclusion which does not follow from (1). Thus, the main addition of Theorem 1 is that it can deal with all values of i , including those which are close to the mean.

This uniform bound has already proved useful for addressing two very different and unrelated questions: (a) to study the rate of convergence of Mann's iterates for non-expansive linear operators (see [15]); and (b) to give an approximation guarantee for an algorithm in combinatorial optimization (see [6]). We hope that the bound may be useful in other settings as well.

In the rest of the paper we present the proof of Theorem 1. In §2 this proof is split into a series of basic steps, each one using only elementary tools that fit together in a surprisingly sharp way to yield the announced result. In the short final section §3 we discuss a simple extension of the main result to the case of sums and differences of Bernoullis, as well as limits of such variables which includes the difference of Poisson distributions.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

We must show that for each $\vec{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in [0, 1]^n$ we have $R_i^n(\vec{p}) \leq M$, where $R_i^n(\vec{p}) = \sigma^n P_i^n$ with $\sigma^n = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i(1-p_i)}$ and

$$P_i^n = \mathbb{P}(S^n = i) = \sum_{\substack{A \subset \{1, \dots, n\} \\ |A|=i}} \prod_{j \in A} p_j \cdot \prod_{j \notin A} (1 - p_j).$$

Usually P_i^n is defined only for $i = 0, \dots, n$. However, $P_i^n = \mathbb{P}(S^n = i) = 0$ is also meaningful outside this range and allows to write the recursive formula

$$P_i^n = p_n P_{i-1}^{n-1} + (1 - p_n) P_i^{n-1}.$$

2.1 Reduction to a sum of 2 Binomial distributions

The expressions P_i^n , σ^n and R_i^n are continuous symmetric functions of $\vec{p}$. We claim that $R_i^n(\vec{p})$ is maximal when the p_j 's take at most two values in $(0, 1)$. In a different context, this result was established in [14, Vaisman] but it has not been published elsewhere.

Proposition 2 *For all $\vec{p} \in [0, 1]^n$ we have*

$$R_i^n(\vec{p}) \leq \sup_{\vec{q} \in [0, 1]^n} \{R_i^n(\vec{q}) : |\{q_j : 0 < q_j < 1\}| \leq 2\}. \quad (2)$$

Proof. Let Q be the set of vectors $\vec{p} \in [0, 1]^n$ attaining the maximum of $R_i^n(\vec{p})$. Since Q is compact we may find $\vec{q} \in Q$ minimal in the lexicographic order. We claim that $|\{q_j : 0 < q_j < 1\}| \leq 2$ from which the result follows.

Assume by contradiction that $\vec{q}$ has 3 different entries $0 < q_r < q_s < q_t < 1$.

Denoting $\vec{q}_0 = (q_j)_{j \neq r, s, t}$ and $\bar{q}_j = 1 - q_j$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_i^n(\vec{q}) &= q_r q_s q_t P_{i-3}^{n-3}(\vec{q}_0) + [\bar{q}_r q_s q_t + q_r \bar{q}_s q_t + q_r q_s \bar{q}_t] P_{i-2}^{n-3}(\vec{q}_0) \\ &\quad + [\bar{q}_r \bar{q}_s q_t + \bar{q}_r q_s \bar{q}_t + q_r \bar{q}_s \bar{q}_t] P_{i-1}^{n-3}(\vec{q}_0) + \bar{q}_r \bar{q}_s \bar{q}_t P_i^{n-3}(\vec{q}_0) \end{aligned}$$

which may be rewritten as $P_i^n(\vec{q}) = F(q_r, q_s, q_t)$ where

$$F(x, y, z) = Axyz + B(xy + xz + yz) + C(x + y + z) + D$$

for appropriate constants A, B, C, D . Similarly $\sigma^n(\vec{q}) = \sqrt{V(q_r, q_s, q_t)}$ with

$$V(x, y, z) = x(1-x) + y(1-y) + z(1-z) + \sigma^{n-3}(\vec{q}_0)^2.$$

Since the maximum of $R_i^n(\cdot) = \sigma^n(\cdot) P_i^n(\cdot)$ is attained at $\vec{q}$, it follows that $\sqrt{V(\cdot)} F(\cdot)$ is maximal at $(q_r, q_s, q_t) \in \text{int}([0, 1]^3)$, and therefore its gradient vanishes at this point, namely

$$\sqrt{V(q_r, q_s, q_t)} \nabla F(q_r, q_s, q_t) + \frac{F(q_r, q_s, q_t)}{2\sqrt{V(q_r, q_s, q_t)}} \nabla V(q_r, q_s, q_t) = 0,$$

so that setting $\lambda = -\frac{F(q_r, q_s, q_t)}{2V(q_r, q_s, q_t)}$ this gives explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} Aq_s q_t + B(q_s + q_t) + C &= \lambda(1 - 2q_r) \\ Aq_r q_t + B(q_r + q_t) + C &= \lambda(1 - 2q_s) \\ Aq_r q_s + B(q_r + q_s) + C &= \lambda(1 - 2q_t). \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting the first two equations and simplifying by $(q_s - q_r) \neq 0$ we get $Aq_t + B = 2\lambda$. Similarly, the second and third equations combined yield $Aq_r + B = 2\lambda$, so that $Aq_t = Aq_r$ and since $q_r \neq q_t$ we conclude $A = 0$.

Now, $A = 0$ implies that the function $F(\cdot)$ depends only on the values of $x+y+z$ and $xy+xz+yz$, while the same holds for $V(\cdot)$ since

$$x(1-x) + y(1-y) + z(1-z) = (x+y+z) - (x+y+z)^2 + 2(xy+xz+yz).$$

Thus, $\sqrt{V(\cdot)}F(\cdot)$ is constant over the set defined by $x+y+z = q_r+q_s+q_t$ and $xy+xz+yz = q_rq_s+q_rq_t+q_sq_t$, and therefore any such vector $(x, y, z, \vec{q}_0)$ maximizes $R_i^n(\cdot)$. Since $\vec{q} \in Q$ is lexicographically minimal, it follows that $q_r \leq x$ and therefore the triple (q_r, q_s, q_t) also solves

$$\begin{cases} \min & x \\ \text{s.t.} & (x, y, z) \in [0, 1]^3 \\ & x + y + z = q_r + q_s + q_t \\ & xy + xz + yz = q_rq_s + q_rq_t + q_sq_t \end{cases}$$

Since q_r, q_s, q_t are different, the gradients of the two equality constraints at this optimal point are linearly independent, while the inequality constraints are non-binding. Hence the Mangasarian-Fromovitz constraint qualification holds and we may find Lagrange multipliers α and β to write down the following necessary optimality conditions

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \alpha + \beta(q_s + q_t) \\ 0 &= \alpha + \beta(q_r + q_t) \\ 0 &= \alpha + \beta(q_s + q_t). \end{aligned}$$

Since $q_r \neq q_s$ the two last equations imply $\alpha = \beta = 0$, which is incompatible with the first equation. This contradiction shows that the constant A cannot be 0, and therefore the assumption $0 < q_r < q_s < q_t < 1$ was absurd. $\square$

Removing all $q_j \in \{0, 1\}$ which correspond to deterministic variables Y_j , the Lemma shows that it suffices to prove (1) for p_j 's taking at most two values, that is to say, for $S^n = U + V$ with $U \sim B(a, \lambda)$ and $V \sim B(b, \mu)$ independent Binomials. More specifically, denoting $B_k^n(p) = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}$ the Binomial probabilities and defining the constant

$$M = \sup_{\substack{a, b, i \in \mathbb{N} \\ \lambda, \mu \in [0, 1]}} \sqrt{a\lambda(1-\lambda) + b\mu(1-\mu)} \sum_{k=0}^i B_k^a(\lambda) B_{i-k}^b(\mu) \quad (3)$$

we have the following sharp estimate

Corollary 3 *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\vec{p} \in [0, 1]^n$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $R_i^n(\vec{p}) \leq M$.*

2.2 An upper bound for the constant M

Before computing the optimal constant M , we establish a simpler upper bound. As a consequence of this analysis it turns out that considering two Binomial distributions in the supremum (3) is essential.

Lemma 4 $M \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{e}}$.

Proof. Let $a, b, i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda, \mu \in [0, 1]$, and assume without loss of generality that $b\mu(1-\mu) \leq a\lambda(1-\lambda)$. Since the probabilities $B_{i-k}^b(\mu)$ are non-negative and add up at most 1, the sum in (3) may be bounded from above by the maximal $B_k^a(\lambda)$, so that $M \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{e}}$ will follow if we prove the inequality

$$\sqrt{2a\lambda(1-\lambda)} B_k^a(\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{e}}.$$

For a and k given, the maximum in $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ is attained at $\lambda = \frac{k+\frac{1}{2}}{a+1}$, so that replacing this value all we must show is that

$$\binom{a}{k} \frac{\sqrt{2a}(k+\frac{1}{2})^{k+\frac{1}{2}}(a-k+\frac{1}{2})^{a-k+\frac{1}{2}}}{(a+1)^{a+1}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{e}}.$$

Let C_k^a denote this expression. We claim that its maximum over k is attained at the extreme values $k = 0$ and $k = a$. Indeed, the quotient between C_{k+1}^a and C_k^a (for $0 \leq k \leq a-1$) may be expressed as

$$\frac{C_{k+1}^a}{C_k^a} = \frac{H(a-k)}{H(k+1)}$$

where $H(x) = x(x - \frac{1}{2})^{x-\frac{1}{2}} / (x + \frac{1}{2})^{x+\frac{1}{2}}$. A simple calculus exercise shows that $H(\cdot)$ is decreasing so that $H(a-k) \geq H(k+1)$ iff $a-k \leq k+1$. This implies that C_k^a decreases for $k \leq \frac{a-1}{2}$ and increases afterwards, so that its maximum is attained at $k = 0$ or $k = a$. The conclusion follows since

$$C_0^a = C_a^a = \frac{\sqrt{a}(a+\frac{1}{2})^{a+\frac{1}{2}}}{(a+1)^{a+1}} = \sqrt{\frac{a}{a+\frac{1}{2}}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2(a+1)}\right)^{a+1} \leq \exp(-\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{e}}. \quad \square$$

REMARK. The proof above shows that for a single binomial distribution we have $\sqrt{a\lambda(1-\lambda)} B_k^a(\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2e}} \sim 0.428$. Since we will prove that $M \sim 0.4688$, it follows that allowing $\lambda \neq \mu$ in (3) is essential.

2.3 Exact value of the constant M

Let $\psi^n(p) = \sum_{k=0}^n B_k^n(p)^2$. Considering the expression in the maximum (3) and using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we get

$$M \leq \sup_{\substack{a, b \in \mathbb{N} \\ \lambda, \mu \in [0, 1]}} \sqrt{a\lambda(1-\lambda) + b\mu(1-\mu)} \sqrt{\psi^a(\lambda) \psi^b(\mu)}.$$

We may restate this supremum using the change of variables $x = a\lambda(1-\lambda)$ and $y = b\mu(1-\mu)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \sqrt{1-4x/a}), \\ \mu &= \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \sqrt{1-4y/b}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, defining $\varphi^n(u) = \psi^n(p^n(u))$ with¹ $p^n(u) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{1-4u/n})$, we may rewrite the previous bound as

$$M \leq \sup_{\substack{a, b \in \mathbb{N} \\ 0 \leq x \leq a/4 \\ 0 \leq y \leq b/4}} \sqrt{x+y} \sqrt{\varphi^a(x) \varphi^b(y)}. \quad (4)$$

The key property for our subsequent analysis is the following.

Proposition 5 $\varphi^n(u)$ increases with n for $n \geq 4u$.

Proof. We begin by observing that $\psi^n(p) = \mathbb{P}(U=V)$ where U and V are independent Binomials $B(n, p)$. Indeed, conditioning on V we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(U=V) &= \sum_{k=0}^n \mathbb{P}(U=V|V=k) \mathbb{P}(V=k) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \mathbb{P}(U=k) \mathbb{P}(V=k) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n B_k^n(p)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\pi_k = \mathbb{P}(U-V=k)$ and consider the z -transform of $U-V$, that is

$$\xi(z) = \mathbb{E}(z^{U-V}) = \sum_{k=-n}^n \pi_k z^k.$$

This map is holomorphic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ with a pole of degree n at the origin and constant coefficient $\pi_0 = \psi^n(p)$. Thus, integrating the function $\xi(z)/z$ along the unit circle $\mathcal{C}$ we get

$$\psi^n(p) = \pi_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{\xi(z)}{z} dz = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \xi(e^{i\theta}) d\theta. \quad (5)$$

¹The same value $\varphi^n(u)$ is obtained if we take the other root $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{1-4u/n})$.

The function $\xi(z)$ may be explicitly computed by expressing $U = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $V = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ as sums of independent Bernoullis of parameter p , namely

$$\begin{aligned}\xi(z) &= \mathbb{E}[\prod_{i=1}^n z^{X_i} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n z^{-Y_i}] \\ &= [p + (1-p)z]^n \cdot [p + (1-p)z^{-1}]^n \\ &= [p^2 + (1-p)^2 + p(1-p)(z + z^{-1})]^n\end{aligned}$$

from which it follows

$$\xi(e^{i\theta}) = [p^2 + (1-p)^2 + 2p(1-p)\cos\theta]^n.$$

Now, evaluating at $p = p^n(u)$, a simple calculation yields

$$\xi(e^{i\theta}) = [1 - \frac{2u(1-\cos\theta)}{n}]^n$$

which plugged into (5) gives the formula

$$\varphi^n(u) = \psi^n(p^n(u)) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} [1 - \frac{2u(1-\cos\theta)}{n}]^n d\theta. \quad (6)$$

Since $n \geq 4u \geq 2u(1-\cos\theta)$, the expression under the integral sign increases with respect to n , from which the conclusion follows. $\square$

This result implies that the supremum in (4) is attained for $a, b \rightarrow \infty$, that it to say

$$M \leq \bar{M} = \sup_{x, y \geq 0} \sqrt{x+y} \sqrt{\varphi^\infty(x) \varphi^\infty(y)} \quad (7)$$

where $\varphi^\infty(u) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi^n(u)$. Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (6) we get an explicit expression for this limit function

$$\varphi^\infty(u) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-2u(1-\cos\theta)} d\theta. \quad (8)$$

Alternatively, we may pass to the limit directly in the original expression

$$\varphi^n(u) = \sum_{k=0}^n B_k^n(p^n(u))^2$$

and since it is easily seen that $np^n(u) \rightarrow u$, the Binomial distribution converges to a Poisson and we get the series representation

$$\varphi^\infty(u) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\frac{e^{-u} u^k}{k!})^2 = e^{-2u} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\frac{u^k}{k!})^2. \quad (9)$$

Clearly, the latter could have also been obtained by a series expansion of (8).

We proceed next to show that the supremum in (7) is attained.

Proposition 6 *The supremum $\bar{M}$ is attained at a unique point (x^*, y^*) with $x^* = y^* = \bar{u} > 0$, where $\bar{u}$ is the optimal solution of $\bar{M} = \sup_{u \geq 0} M(u)$ with*

$$M(u) = \sqrt{2u} \varphi^\infty(u) = \sqrt{2u} e^{-2u} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{u^k}{k!}\right)^2.$$

Proof. Denoting $h(u) = \ln \varphi^\infty(u)$, it is clear that solving (7) is equivalent to

$$\sup_{x, y \geq 0} \ln(x + y) + h(x) + h(y). \quad (10)$$

We claim that $h(\cdot)$ is strictly concave, so that this problem has at most one optimal solution. We will then prove that there is a point $\bar{u} \in (0, 1)$ that maximizes $M(u)$ and therefore it satisfies $\frac{1}{2\bar{u}} + h'(\bar{u}) = 0$, from which it follows at once that the point (x^*, y^*) with $x^* = y^* = \bar{u}$ is a stationary point for (10) and is therefore the unique optimal solution.

$h(\cdot)$ is strictly concave. For each $u \geq 0$ the function

$$\rho_u(\theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi\psi^\infty(u)} e^{-2u(1-\cos\theta)}$$

defines a probability density on the interval $[0, 2\pi]$. Moreover, using (8), a direct computation allows to express the second derivative $h''(u)$ as

$$h''(u) = -4 \left[\int_0^{2\pi} (1 - \cos\theta)^2 \rho_u(\theta) d\theta - \left(\int_0^{2\pi} (1 - \cos\theta) \rho_u(\theta) d\theta \right)^2 \right] < 0,$$

where the last inequality follows from Jensen's inequality applied to the strictly convex function $z \mapsto z^2$.

Existence of a unique maximizer $\bar{u}$ for $M(u)$. The strict concavity of $h(\cdot)$ implies that $M(\cdot)$ is strictly log-concave. Since $M(0) = 0$ and $M(u) > 0$ for $u > 0$, the existence of a unique maximizer $\bar{u} \in (0, 1)$ will follow if we prove that $M'(1) < 0$. Now, using the expression (9) we may readily compute $M'(u)$ which evaluated at $u = 1$ gives

$$M'(1) = \frac{e^{-2}}{\sqrt{2}} \left[4 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!(k+1)!} - 3 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \right].$$

The first two terms of both sums cancel out, and then we conclude

$$M'(1) = \frac{e^{-2}}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{4}{(k!)^2} \left[\frac{1}{k+1} - \frac{3}{4} \right] < 0.$$

□

REMARK. Numerically we find that $\bar{u} \sim 0.39498892975658451$ which gives the approximate value for $\bar{M} \sim 0.46882235549939533$.

REMARK. We observe that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\frac{u^k}{k!})^2 = B(0, 2u)$ where $B(0, \cdot)$ is a modified Bessel function of the first kind, namely the solution of $x^2 y'' + xy' - x^2 y = 0$. Thus, it seems unlikely to find simpler formulas for $\bar{M}$ or $\bar{u}$ in terms of known constants and functions.

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 1, it remains to show that

Proposition 7 *$M = \bar{M}$ and the bound (1) is sharp.*

Proof. Both conclusions will follow simultaneously if we exhibit a family of S^n 's and i 's for which $\sigma^n \mathbb{P}(S^n = i)$ tends to $\bar{M}$. To this end let us consider for S^n the particular case of a sum of $n = 2a$ Bernoullis, half of which have $p_i = \lambda$ while for the other half we take $p_i = \mu = 1 - \lambda$, with $\lambda = \bar{u}/a$. Hence, $S^n = U + V$ with $U \sim B(a, \lambda)$ and $V \sim B(a, 1 - \lambda)$ independent Binomials. If we now take $i = a$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^n \mathbb{P}(S^n = a) &= \sqrt{2a\lambda(1-\lambda)} \sum_{k=0}^a \binom{a}{k} \binom{a}{a-k} \lambda^{2k} (1-\lambda)^{2(a-k)} \\ &= \sqrt{2\bar{u}(1-\frac{\bar{u}}{a})} \sum_{k=0}^a \binom{a}{k}^2 \left(\frac{\bar{u}}{a}\right)^{2k} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{u}}{a}\right)^{2(a-k)} \end{aligned}$$

which is easily seen to converge towards $M(\bar{u}) = \bar{M}$ when $a \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

3 A simple extension and a final comment

As a straightforward corollary of Theorem 1 we get that the bound (1) still holds for any random variable $S^n = \sum_{i=1}^n \pm X_i$ that can be expressed as *sums and differences* of non-homogeneous independent Bernoullis. Moreover, the bound will remain true for limits of such variables, so that it holds in fact for all combinations of sums and differences of Bernoulli, Binomial, and Poisson variables. We record the purely Poissonian case in the next

Corollary 8 *Let $S = X - Y$ with $X \sim \mathcal{P}(x)$ and $Y \sim \mathcal{P}(y)$ two independent Poisson random variables. Then for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\sigma_S \mathbb{P}(S=i) \leq M.$$

The bound M is attained with equality when $x = y = \bar{u}$ and $i = 0$.

Proof. The upper bound follows from the previous analysis. For the last claim we notice that when $x = y = u$ and $i = 0$ we have

$$\sigma_S \mathbb{P}(S=0) = \sqrt{2u} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (e^{-u} \frac{u^k}{k!})^2 = M(u)$$

so that the bound M is attained with equality if $u = \bar{u}$. □

REMARK. In the case of a single Poisson variable $X \sim \mathcal{P}(x)$ (*i.e.* $y = 0$), which is obtained as limit of Binomials $B(n, \frac{x}{n})$, the remark after Lemma 4 implies the stronger and sharp estimate $\sigma_X \mathbb{P}(X=i) = \sqrt{x} e^{-x} \frac{x^i}{i!} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2e}}$.

A natural question arising from these observations, and which seems to be open, is to characterize the class of distributions that can be obtained as limits of sums and differences of Bernoullis. A fundamental result of Kintchine [11] (see also the classical book by Gnedenko and Kolmogorov [8, Theorem 2, p.115]) characterizes those distributions that are obtained as limits of sums of independent random variables. The latter may or may not be Bernoullis though, so that this general result provides only necessary conditions for our more specific question.

References

- [1] Ahlswede R., Winter A., *Strong Converse for Identification via Quantum Channels*, <http://www.arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0012127>
- [2] Alon N., Spencer J., *The Probabilistic Method*, Wiley, New York, (1992).
- [3] Azuma K., *Weighted Sums of Certain Dependent Random Variables*, Tohoku Math. Journ. 19, 357–367 (1967).
- [4] Bernstein S.N., *On certain modifications of Chebyshev's inequality*, Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR 17(6), 275–277, (1937).
- [5] Chernoff H., *A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations*, Annals of Mathematical Statistics 23, 493–507 (1952).
- [6] Cominetti R., Correa J., San Martín J., *Optimal selection of customers for a last-minute offer*, submitted (2008).

- [7] Godbole A.P., Hitczenko P., *Beyond the method of bounded differences*, DIMACS Ser. Discrete Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci. 41, 43–58, (1998).
- [8] Gnedenko B.V., Kolmogorov A.N., *Limit Distributions for Sums of Independent Random Variables*, Addison-Wesley Publ. Co. (1954).
- [9] Hoeffding W., *Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables*, Journal of the American Statistical Association 58(301), 13-30, (1963).
- [10] Jogdeo K., Samuels S.M., *Monotone convergence of binomial probabilities and a generalization of Ramanujan's equation*, The Annals of Mathematical Statistics 39, 1191–1195, (1968).
- [11] Kintchine A.Ya., *Zur Theorie der unbeschränkt teilbaren Verteilungsgesetze*, Rec. Mat [Mat. Sbornik] N.S. 2(44), 79-120 (1937).
- [12] McDiarmid C., *On the method of bounded differences*, In Surveys in Combinatorics, London Math. Soc. Lectures Notes 141, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 148-188, (1989).
- [13] Siegel A., *Median bounds and their application*, Journal of Algorithms 38, 184–236, (2001).
- [14] Vaisman J., *Convergencia fuerte del método de medias sucesivas para operadores lineales no-expansivos*, Memoria de Ingeniería Civil Matemática, Universidad de Chile, (2005).
- [15] Vaisman J., *Strong convergence and speed of convergence of Mann's iterates for nonexpansive linear operators*, forthcoming (2008).